

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT SEATTLE

8 JOSEPH P. TRAUTT JR, *et al.*,

9 Plaintiffs,

10 v.

11 KEYSTONE RV COMPANY,

12 Defendant.
13

Case No. C19-342-RAJ-MLP

MINUTE ORDER

14 The following Minute Order is made at the direction of the Court, the Hon. Michelle L.
15 Peterson, United States Magistrate Judge:

16 On March 30, 2020, the Court heard oral argument regarding Defendant's motion for
17 enforcement of the stipulated protective order (dkt. # 15) and Plaintiffs' motion to strike
18 objections and compel documents responsive to requests for production (dkt. # 21) in this
19 products liability action. With regard to Defendant's motion, Defendant opposes Plaintiffs'
20 assertion that Defendant's schematic drawings produced in response to discovery requests are
21 not confidential pursuant to the stipulated protective order signed on September 24, 2019 (dkt. #
22 14). Defendant argues the schematic drawings, which detail a dinette feature in a trailer designed
23 and manufactured by Defendant, should be considered confidential as either confidential

1 business information or as trade secrets. Plaintiffs argue the schematic drawings are not trade
2 secrets because the dinette feature can be easily reproduced and therefore constitutes readily
3 ascertainable information.

4 The Court reviewed the motion and supporting declarations (dkt. ## 15, 16, 17),
5 Plaintiffs' response and supporting declaration (dkt. ## 18, 19), and Defendant's reply (dkt. #
6 20). Based on the record, the Court finds the schematic drawings are properly considered
7 confidential business information and are therefore considered confidential pursuant to the
8 stipulated protective order. The Court declines to rule on whether the schematic drawings
9 constitute trade secrets.

10 Defendant also requests an award of \$2,500.00 in attorney's fees incurred in connection
11 with bringing its motion. In support of its request, Defendant references email correspondence
12 with opposing counsel regarding the potential frivolous nature of their challenge to the
13 confidential designation. Having heard clarification from Plaintiffs' counsel regarding this
14 correspondence during oral argument, the Court declines to impose fees at this time.

15 With regard to Plaintiffs' motion, Plaintiffs seek to strike Defendant's objections to their
16 discovery requests and to compel production of responsive documents. Defendant argues it
17 provided specific objections to Plaintiffs' requests and that it is unaware of any requested
18 document that it has failed to produce.

19 The Court reviewed the motion and supporting declaration (dkt. ## 21, 22), Defendant's
20 response and supporting declaration (dkt. ## 24, 25), and Plaintiffs' reply (dkt. # 26). The Court
21 finds Defendant's discovery objections are generally specific and that it properly identified
22 responsive documents it would produce. Further, Plaintiffs are unable to identify any outstanding
23 document or category of documents that Defendant has not produced at this time.

1 For the foregoing reasons and the reasons stated on the record, the Court GRANTS
2 Defendant's motion (dkt. # 15) and DENIES Plaintiffs' motion (dkt. # 21). Defendant's request
3 for fees associated with bringing its motion is DENIED at this time. The Clerk is directed to send
4 copies of this order to the parties and to the Honorable Richard A. Jones.

5 Dated this 30th day of March, 2020.

6
7 

8 MICHELLE L. PETERSON
9 United States Magistrate Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23